

REMARKS

The Office examined claims 1-14, and all claims are rejected. With this response, claims 1-4, 7-9 and 11-13 are amended, claim 10 is cancelled without prejudice, and new claims 15-17 are added. The claims are amended to place the claims in better form, and to remove the reference numerals, which has no effect on the scope of the claims. See MPEP § 608.01(m). The claims are not amended to distinguish the claims from the cited reference. New claims 15 and 16 correspond to claims 11 and 12 in non-means-plus-function format. Support for the new claims can be found at least from Figure 2 and paragraph [0047] of the published application (U.S. Appl. Publ. No. 2002/0168978).

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejections in light of the following remarks. The independent claims are 1, 7, 13 and 15.

Claim Rejections Under § 102

In section 2, on page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Krishnamurthi et al. (U.S. Appl. Publ. No. 2001/0023186). Applicant respectfully submits Krishnamurthi does not disclose or suggest independent claim 1, because Krishnamurthi fails to disclose or suggest all of the limitations recited in claim 1. Krishnamurthi at least fails to disclose or suggest keeping a record containing information about certain addresses with which a message communication is not allowed in a switching center, and preventing in the switching center transmission of a message if the message is related to an unallowed address, as recited in claim 1.

Krishnamurthi discloses a mobile switching center (MSC) 102 that includes a memory 200 for storing information relating to subscriber units serviced by the system 100. The Subscriber Service Records stored in the memory 200 are not the equivalent of the record recited in claim 1, because they do not contain information about certain addresses with which communication is not allowed. Instead, the memory 200 contains information related to a list of service options that a particular subscriber is authorized to use. See Krishnamurthi paragraph [0036]. “Service options” refer to the service capabilities of the system, and may be applications such as voice, data, facsimile, or SMS. See Krishnamurthi [0036]. Therefore, the memory 200 includes information regarding services that a particular system can provide, and which

subscribers have access to which services. However, the memory 200 does not contain information about certain addresses with which communication is not allowed, as recited in claim 1.

Since Krishnamurthi does not disclose or suggest keeping the record as recited in claim 1, Krishnamurthi also necessarily fails to disclose or suggest preventing the transmission of a message if said message is related to an unallowed address according to analysis of information in the record. Instead, Krishnamurthi discusses that a base station 1108 seeks authorization from the MSC 102 to set up a call with a subscriber unit SU1112, because the MSC 102 has the information needed for the call set up. See Krishnamurthi paragraph [0040]. Based on the information, i.e. Subscribed Services Record, for the subscriber unit SU1112, a message processor 202 at the MSC 102 will determine whether the subscriber unit is authorized to use the service option that the base station is asking for. See Krishnamurthi paragraph [0041]. Therefore, Krishnamurthi merely describes that a mobile switching center checks subscription details for a subscriber to determine whether the subscriber has permission to access a particular service. In contrast, claim 1 recites that transmission of a message is prevented when the message is related to an unallowed address. The unallowed address recited in claim 1 is not the equivalent of the subscription details discussed by Krishnamurthi, because the subscription details relate to authorization to use particular services, while the unallowed address is an address to which message communication is not allowed. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above, claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by Krishnamurthi.

Independent claims 7 and 11 contain limitations similar to those recited in claim 1, and therefore for at least the reasons discussed above in relation to claim 1, are not disclosed or suggested by Krishnamurthi.

Claims 2-6, 8-9 and 12-14 all ultimately depend from an independent claim, and are believed to be patentable over Krishnamurthi at least in view of their dependencies.

New Claims 15-17

New claim 15 contains limitations similar to those recited in claim 11, and therefore for at least the reasons discussed above in relation to claim 11, claim 15 is believed to be novel and nonobvious in view of the cited references.

Claims 16 and 17 ultimately depend from an independent claim, and are believed to be novel and nonobvious over the cited references at least in view of their dependencies.

Conclusion

It is therefore respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. The undersigned authorizes the Commissioner to charge deposit account 23-0442 for any fee deficiency required to submit this response.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: December 22, 2006

WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS
& ADOLPHSON LLP
Bradford Green, Building Five
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, CT 06468
Telephone: (203) 261-1234
Facsimile: (203) 261-5676
USPTO Customer No. 004955


Keith R. Obert
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 58,051